

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/608,130

Applicant(s)

SHAHOIAN, ERIK J.

Examiner

Jean E Lesperance

Art Unit

2674

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jean Lesperance.

(3) _____.

(2) John Alemanni.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 10 November 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 11, 31, and 31

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The applicant's representative argued that the prior art does not teach "an elastic material disposed so as to provide a gap between said core member to limit a range of motion of said magnet" as amended in claim 1. The examiner advises the applicant's representative to amend the claim 1 to add further structure to it. As for Claim 3 and 11, the examiner advises the applicant's representative to amend the flexible member to be more specific. The examiner agrees to make further when received the amendment.